

MICHIGAN CHILDREN'S INSTITUTE

Box No. 2097  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

*Journal  
of the  
Child Welfare League  
of America  
Inc.*

# child welfare

Administrative Reorganization  
of Child Welfare

Must Caseworkers Do  
Everything?

Understanding Children in  
Today's World

Administrative Supervision  
vs. Consultation

*May 1956*

# CHILD WELFARE JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc

HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Administrative Reorganization of Child Welfare . . . . .	1
By Norris E. Class	
Must Caseworkers Do Everything? . . . .	6
By Jeanet Swenson	
Understanding Children in Today's World . . .	12
By Benjamin Spock, M.D.	
Administrative Supervision vs. Consultation . .	19
By Edith S. Baxter	
Readers' Forum . . . . .	25
Book Notes . . . . .	26
Classified Personnel Openings . . . . .	28

Editorial and general office: 345 East 46th Street, N. Y. 17, N. Y. Published monthly except August and September by the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 35 cents.

VOL. XXXV

No. 5

## CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

### Officers

MARSHALL FIELD, *President*, New York  
 MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, *Vice-Pres.*, Hartford, Conn.  
 MRS. JOE HUMM GARDNER, *Vice-Pres.*, Marshall, Va.  
 MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER, *Vice-Pres.*, New York  
 MRS. GEORGE I. WEST, *Vice-Pres.*, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 MRS. RAY W. WILLOUGHBY, *Vice-Pres.*, San Angelo, Texas  
 MISS LOIS WILBY, *Secretary*, Chicago, Ill.  
 THOMAS M. PETERS, *Treasurer*, New York  
 JOSEPH H. REED, *Executive Dir.*  
 HELEN R. HAGAN, *Asst. Exec. Dir.*

### Board of Directors

DR. LEONA BAUMGARTNER, New York, N. Y.  
 FRANK S. BAXLEY, JR., Seattle, Wash.  
 MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, New York, N. Y.  
 JUDGE JANE M. BOLIN, New York, N. Y.  
 JAMES BROWN, IV, Chicago, Ill.  
 MRS. ROBERT A. BROWN, Des Moines, Iowa  
 MRS. SARAH R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.  
 MRS. CLARENCE A. CHICHESTER, Piedmont, Cal.  
 DR. ALTON DAVIS, Chicago, Ill.  
 MRS. IRVING EDISON, St. Louis, Mo.  
 JUDGE GEORGE EDWARDS, Detroit, Mich.  
 DR. MARTHA M. ELLIOT, Washington, D. C.  
 ALAN S. GUSMER, Cleveland, Ohio  
 CLYDE GLEZ, Los Angeles, Cal.  
 AUSTIN T. GRAVES, New York, N. Y.  
 JOSEPH F. HAYS, Atlanta, Ga.  
 SHELLY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.  
 MRS. KATH B. HELMS, Columbia, S. C.  
 LESLIE L. JACOBS, Dallas, Texas  
 JUDGE HARRY W. LINDEMAN, Newark, N. J.  
 LEONARD W. MAYOR, New York, N. Y.  
 ROBERT M. MULLORD, Boston, Mass.  
 GEORGE M. NAYLOR, Boston, Mass.  
 JACK N. PRETZER, Chicago, Ill.  
 DR. JULIUS B. RICHMOND, SYRACUSE, N. Y.  
 JULIUS F. ROTHMAN, New York, N. Y.  
 WILLIAM D. SCHMIDT, Cleveland, Ohio  
 MRS. J. FRAZER SMITH, Memphis, Tenn.  
 DR. THOMAS M. SOGGI, Northfield, Minn.  
 REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGER, Milwaukee, Wis.  
 JOHN G. THIBAN, Washington, D. C.  
 MRS. JUAN T. TRUPEL, New York, N. Y.  
 C. ROLLIN ZANE, Hartford, Conn.

## COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GANE, *Chairman*  
*Executive Director, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y.*

### Policy Committee

MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE  
 MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER  
 MR. C. ROLLIN ZANE

### Advisory Committee

MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE  
*Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*  
 THELMA K. FLOWER  
*Executive Director, Family Services Society, Akron, Ohio*  
 ADELAIDE KAISER  
*Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*  
 FRIDA M. KUBIMANN  
*Executive Secretary*  
*First Family Day Care Association, Philadelphia, Pa.*  
 EUGENE LAZAR  
*Personnel Director*  
*Jewish Child Care Association, New York, N. Y.*  
 EUGENE LEWIS  
*Day Care Consultant*  
*State Department of Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.*  
 ELIZABETH G. MEIER  
*Associate Professor*  
*New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.*  
 ROBERT F. OTT  
*Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Welfare, Boston, Mass.*  
 IRVING RIMMER  
*Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N. Y.*  
 SUSANNE SCHULZE  
*Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration*  
*University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*  
 VERNIE WELD  
*Assistant Executive Director*  
*Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.*  
 RUTH WEISNBARGER  
*Assistant Director*  
*Sheltering Arms Childrens Service, New York, N. Y.*

ADMI

Norri  
 Profess  
 Universi  
 Los Ange

THE PR  
 assistan  
 speakin  
 the wel  
 pression  
 depress  
 state pu  
 well org  
 the adm  
 with th  
 brought  
 many i  
 from th  
 the enc  
 admini  
 Securit  
 with th  
 nent st  
 fare re  
 was gr  
 mediat  
 public  
 taken  
 planne  
 Securi  
 federal  
 states,  
 seem  
 about  
 child  
 sibilit  
 welfar  
 To  
 factor  
 for a  
 and c  
 it is c  
 if at  
 sider

CHID

# ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION OF CHILD WELFARE

Norris E. Class

Professor, School of Social Work  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California

*This paper is the basis of a symposium. The discussions will appear in subsequent issues. The thesis is that the generally current arrangement of grouping public assistance and social services for children into a single state department of social welfare is unsound, both professionally and in terms of social policy and planning.*

THE PRESENT pattern of "twinning" public assistance and child welfare, departmentally speaking, would seem to stem largely from the welfare organizational spree of the "depression" days. It will be recalled that the depression of the 1930's arrived with few state public welfare departments sufficiently well organized or well established to take on the administrative responsibility of coping with the all but overwhelming problems it brought. State emergency relief agencies, in many instances, were established quite apart from the existing state welfare agency. With the ending of the emergency phase of relief administration and the passage of the Social Security Act, many states were faced squarely with the need to do something about permanent state welfare organization or state welfare reorganization. Coupled with this there was great pressure on the states to take immediate advantage of the federal grants for public assistance. Consequently, the action taken tended to be "quick" rather than well planned. Finally, the inclusion in the Social Security Act of Title V, Part 3, providing for federal child welfare services grants to the states, was all that was necessary to make it seem logical—almost imperative—to bring about the grouping of public assistance and child welfare programs as the proper responsibilities of a new or reorganized state public welfare department.

To be sure, there were present at the time factors which did not seem to augur too well for a fortunate "union" of public assistance and child welfare. It was not clear then, and it is certainly not clear now, to what extent, if at all, the public assistances were considered as having a "social service" com-

ponent. Even more confusing was the question: Are the public assistance programs all of the same nature? In other words, is public assistance for the aged, in reality, the same kind of a program as aid to dependent children? This uncertainty and confusion was bound to have its negative effect all the way down the line, from the top state administrator to the local public assistance workers and local child welfare workers. Moreover, there was the administrative imbalance between public assistance and child welfare. Granting the sheer administrative magnitude of the assistance program for the aged, plus the political strength and pressure of the elderly, one could wonder then, and now, how a state welfare board or top welfare administrator could take, or be expected to take, the time to deal fully or properly with the problems of a relatively small number of children, a group with much less political significance.

Anyhow, the union of public assistance and child welfare took place, and we now have the experience of a fifth of a century to view in retrospect. One main finding is this: While a few small benefits to child welfare have accrued from this "grouping together," the early concern was justified. By and large, many state departments of public welfare have become simply, as far as community understanding goes, assistance agencies, and in some places they still are only a relief or pension office. Moreover, financial assistance or relief in the minds of many, including legislators and governors, is a "business," and in state after state there is an increasing advocacy of appointing a "business man" to the job of administrator.

Public assistance problems seem to get top priority in administrative concern. At the time of the legislative session, it is hardly reasonable to expect even the sincerest and best intentioned administrator, or board, to upset the apple cart of the public assistance budget by taking a courageous, but perhaps not immediately popular, position in respect to some children's program. In fact, taking such a position might also do such things as offend the chairman of the ways and means committee who knows all about children by virtue of having been one once, or who is morally convinced that the place of all women is in the home!

This imbalance also extends downward to the local level of administrative operations. Practically, and with great statistical frequency, county public welfare administrators are selected mainly for their ability to "run" the public assistance programs. Of course, it is hoped that these administrators will be interested in the child welfare programs and the problems of the workers in them, but in case they are not, there is always the state child welfare field consultant to give help and encouragement. From the viewpoint of sound theory of organization, this arrangement may seem somewhat of an administrative anomaly, but at least it does keep the marriage going!

### ***Duties of State Child Welfare Agency***

If reorganization of child welfare is overdue, what form might it take? Of course, it goes without saying that the pattern of organization will vary from state to state, because of intrinsic factors such as geographic size, population, urbanization, industrialism, social mobility, cultural attitudes, and the present stage of the development of both social welfare programs generally and social services for children specifically. It would seem likely, however, that most of the states could profit, socially and perhaps economically, by the establishment of a separate state child welfare agency, with the latter administering, or supervising, the statutorily provided programs of social services for children.

What these state child welfare agencies should be called is of considerable significance from the viewpoint of community interpretation and acceptance; therefore much time and thought need to be given to the task of the proper titling of these departments. However, far more important is the task of deciding which functions should be included or excluded. By and large, it would seem that in general present programs in state child welfare divisions of existing public welfare departments would normally be included. They would generally comprise:

- 1) state responsibility for the federally-sponsored program of child welfare services;
- 2) licensing responsibility as it relates to foster care programs serving children;
- 3) certain duties in relation to adoption of children;
- 4) certain responsibilities for the direct placement of children in foster care or the supervision of the activity, which is performed by a local public agency but frequently paid for in part or in whole by the state.

In those states where there is a subsidy arrangement for private children's agencies, this too would seem to be a proper responsibility for a state child welfare agency, as would be the handling of interstate foster care placement requirements if they are statutorily prescribed.

To have a separate department take over only the present functions of existing divisions of child welfare, however, is giving such a department far too limited and narrow a scope, especially in light of the unmet social service needs of children which we acknowledge today. It would seem that a separately established department of child welfare should stand ready to perform, either directly or supervisorially, a clearly defined protective service to neglected children; possibly a clearly defined guardianship service, and perhaps a redefined program of service to unmarried mothers. Should the state be currently operating any group care programs, such as institutions for dependent, emotionally disturbed or delinquent children, including state or regional juvenile detention homes, shelter homes, and certain types of residential treatment centers, these responsibilities also might be assigned to this department. Likewise, if the homemaker program ever

becomes widespread, this too might be a service, some part of which would be a proper responsibility of a state department of child welfare.

### ***Not Included in Program***

The Aid to Dependent Children program needs special comment. Generally speaking, the ADC program should not, at least at this time, be separated out from the other public assistance programs to become an administrative part of a new state department of child welfare. From the viewpoint of practicality, to wait until this separation of ADC from the other public assistances could be effected, would probably delay interminably the achievement of a separate department. The reason, however, for not including ADC is more than a matter of practicality. The transfer of ADC to this new organization could not help but give it an "assistance" coloration, which would tend to hinder the realization of its "service" goals. Moreover, not having the ADC within the new organizational fold does not mean that the new department of child welfare could not serve the ADC clients. It should serve the latter in the same manner in which, we hope, it would serve the beneficiaries of the old age and survivors' insurance, veterans' administration beneficiaries, and the beneficiaries of other income security programs insofar as they seek help with problems relating to children.

In passing, it might be noted that from the viewpoint of organization based on homogeneous functions, or what one writer calls "natural affiliates," these new departments of child welfare would not properly take on the administration of crippled children's services, although that program may still be a responsibility of some existing public welfare department. The case has been well made for crippled children's service being an integral part of a progressive public health department, and a department of child welfare should be related to it only cooperatively. A state child guidance service, as such, would also not seem to be a proper responsibility of a state department of child

welfare. This does not mean, however, that a department of child welfare should not be staffed with psychiatric personnel to help carry out its functions. To this end it is conceivable that a state department of child welfare might even operate residential treatment centers, facilities for those children being helped, for example, to live in foster homes or to recover from severe neglect or maltreatment—these being specific functions of the department. But in no way should a state department of child welfare take on the function of general psychiatric service to children which, again from a theory of organization, would seem to belong administratively elsewhere, although there still seems to be some controversy as to which administrative auspice it should be under.

### ***Suggested Administrative Setup***

Should chance or circumstance bring about the dissolution of the union of public assistance and child welfare, it might also be interesting to speculate about the type of department it should be and the nature of its state-local relations.

Although the public administration theorists may look a little askance, it would seem that a policy-making board type of department would be preferable. This preference arises for three simple reasons:

One, a board, properly selected, would tend to insure, at any given time, a greater "social" representativeness than a single executive type of department. In programs of this nature—the welfare of children—this is a highly essential feature.

Two, a board with a sufficiently long-time tenure of memberships which overlap in appointment would provide the stability and continuity which is also so essential in this kind of program.

Three, social service programs for children cannot possibly be spelled out in legislation, considering all the details of operations, and when that statutory specificity is absent, there is more need for board or group deliberation.

To be sure, it is important to place responsibility for administrative operations squarely upon the chief executive officer. It is important that he be in a position to act decisively and with practical immediacy in matters that relate to clearly defined functions. But the history of American public administration is certainly not that of delegating the function of social policy formulation to one



person when the area of responsibility, such as the welfare of children, is of such vital concern to the present and future well-being of the community. Witness the tenacious clinging to the public board of education system!

### **State-Local Relationship**

Closely related to type of departmentalization is the pattern of state-local relations. In this matter it is speculatively possible to conceive of a change as being in order. Sooner or later, it would seem that there must be recognition of the fact that in child welfare, as in a hundred other public services, it is not always administratively sound, nor even sometimes humanly possible, to follow the traditional pattern of state supervision with local administration. Certainly, if administrative efficiency and economy are to be achieved, and humanitarianism to needy persons increased, more and more public programs will have to be directly administered by the state agency but we hope through a series of properly located regional offices. In fact, what is particularly needed in public welfare is the formulation of a concept of administrative regionalism, which permits a fairly broad basis of operations, but which is still sufficiently limited in area size that it will be possible to secure the identification and participation of the community in welfare planning and in approaching local welfare problems. The role of a state child welfare agency, in relation to service operations in a regional form of administration, might well vary. The important thing, however, is that the state agency have the competence and flexibility to assist localities and regions in undertakings which have been indigenously arrived at. In fact, it would be well for these child welfare departments to have funds for assisting programs beyond the legal responsibility of the state agency. In other words, the conception of the state agency would still be that of complementing, rather than displacing, local interest, initiative, or enterprise.

The implementation of the process to bring about the reorganization of social

services for children will not be easy. There will be all the problems and resistances usually engendered in any proposal involving significant change. These will range from trying to reach agreement about the specific legislative expression of the statute creating the new department, all the way to reassuring the file clerk in an existing local public welfare office that the new proposal will not result in her becoming unemployed.

The attitude of top state administrators will probably vary. Some will regard the separation with genuine regret; others, in truth, may feel greatly relieved to see a separation effected. The feeling of relief upon the part of the administrators may spring from different sources, ranging from the guilt in not having been truly understanding or interested, to guilt arising out of not having had enough time or energy to give to the child welfare "side" of their department. There will be other administrators, perhaps, who will find the proposal of separation an ego blow. Although they may or may not be too interested in or identified with the child welfare part of the department, they may still have the feeling that these programs make the department more than "just" an assistance agency.

Some of the greatest resistance to reorganization, however, may well stem from the child welfare workers themselves. In many instances the resistance from the child welfare personnel will perhaps be unconsciously motivated. For instance, although there may be marked professional dissatisfaction with the present setup, there is also the feeling that the child welfare division is "organizationally" secure. With the exception of an occasional "blast" from a newspaper or a politician, most likely about adoptions or day care centers, the "heat" is more frequently on the public assistance programs, and the child welfare programs go their way in relative peace. This state of affairs can easily produce the attitude which favors change some day and somehow—but certainly *not now!*

Another factor may operate to produce resistance to reorganization among existing

There  
stances  
volving  
e from  
specific  
reating  
eassur-  
public  
will not  
  
trators  
rd the  
ers, in  
see a  
f upon  
spring  
m the  
anding  
ot hav-  
to the  
tment.  
rhaps,  
ion an  
not be  
e child  
y may  
grams  
st" an  
  
organ-  
m the  
many  
d wel-  
sciously  
re may  
n with  
feeling  
organiza-  
of an  
r or a  
ons or  
re fre-  
grams,  
ir way  
rs can  
favors  
it cer-  
  
roduce  
existing

child welfare personnel—the need to face up squarely to doing something immediately about some knotty problems of child welfare. Should reorganization become a possibility, child welfare workers would be under considerable pressure to become more specific as to the form and operation of public protective services, and guardianship providing services. A separate state department might also necessitate child welfare workers doing something about making licensing programs a truly practical safeguard for foster children, predicated upon clearly defined and readily enforceable laws. These program formulations, or reformulations, are not simple or easy, and at first glance might be overwhelming to a degree which would greatly dampen the enthusiasm for a separate department—be this the price of accomplishing it!

### ***Some Significant Developments***

Hopefully, there are at the present time some developments which may be conducive to helping child welfare tackle some of these problems, especially those with a socio-legal aspect such as the child protective service, guardianship providing service, and licensing. One of these developments is the reactivated interest in "social work and the law" which is taking place in some of the schools of social work. If nothing else, a major benefit of this development should be that of giving to social workers an orientation to legal reality, something enabling them to live with and not aloof from the law. Another development is the growing emphasis upon an interdisciplinary approach to child welfare programs which was especially stressed at the Midcentury White House Conference, and has since been continually stressed by the federal Children's Bureau and the Child Welfare League of America publications. Child welfare personnel, in working with other disciplines, may derive from this experience some of the strength and the know-how to deal with these rather formidable problems which, not dealt with, stand as road blocks to organizational separateness. Even with help, the proper resolution will not be easy. The professional strength, however, generated in taking them on will perhaps carry over and furnish the initial energy for "going it" separately—professionally, responsibly, and resolutely.

A book of reassuring,  
practical advice for  
those who have—or  
plan to have—

*adopted children*

# **Adoption— And After**

**By LOUISE RAYMOND**

Foreword by **SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG**,  
Special Consultant, Child Study  
Association of America

Drawing on her own experience as a foster parent, and on thorough research in the field, the author shows parents of adopted children how to build a strong, happy, confident family life—even in the face of those extra hazards involved in adopting an older or a handicapped child.

"Mrs. Raymond has been able to handle the subject of parenthood through adoption with sensitivity and a warm understanding of the many factors involved . . . Her chapters on the problems that may come up after adoption should prove helpful to adoptive families."

—HELEN W. HALLINAN,  
Administrative Supervisor,  
Adoption Service,  
The Catholic Home Bureau

"Louise Raymond has a gift for describing intelligently and sensibly the ups and downs in adoption. I most warmly and heartily recommend her book."

—ROBERTA ANDREWS,  
Spence-Chapin Adoption Service

*With bibliography and list of approved  
adoption agencies. Index.*

*\$3.00 at all bookstores*

**HARPER & BROTHERS**  
49 East 33rd Street • New York 16

# MUST CASEWORKERS DO EVERYTHING?\*

**Jeanet Swenson**

Supervisor, Foster Care  
The New England Home for Little  
Wanderers  
Boston, Mass.

*The author draws on the experiences of her own agency to point out how a case aide can be used effectively, in order to permit the social worker to utilize her own limited time most advantageously.*

IN ORDER to have a useful case aide program, caseworkers need to think through carefully just what and when they may delegate to an untrained helper.

In reply to our title question, "Must Caseworkers Do Everything?", my answer would be a resounding "Yes!". A caseworker in a child care agency needs to be willing and ready to change a baby's diaper or to recognize a car-sick child before the crisis occurs. These are treatment and diagnostic skills not included in our graduate school curricula, but they are important to caseworkers who work with children.

Shopping trips with adolescents are time-consuming and often not very productive. To delegate such a trip to an untrained helper might release several hours of a caseworker's time for interviewing or other more professional-seeming tasks. But some adolescents are as temperamental about choosing their clothes as they are in reactions to parental authority, and a shopping trip may need as skillful casework handling as an interview with a returned runaway.

Does it seem that I am starting a case against case aides? Not really. A caseworker should be willing and ready to do everything, but not all of the time. Before tasks are delegated to a case aide, no matter how time-consuming they may be, it is important to consider what effect the delegation may have on the client, and the client-worker relationship.

I believe that the use of case aides in a child care agency needs to be a thoughtfully planned program, and the thought and the planning must be a cooperative project, in-

cluding executive, supervisor, caseworkers and the case aides, themselves.

The New England Home for Little Wanderers first hired a case aide in the fall of 1954. A second case aide was added to the staff in April, 1955, a third in September, and we are now thinking of possibly adding a fourth. After a year and a half, the program is still considered an experiment. We think that in general it is a successful experiment, but we recognize mistakes we have made, and are working toward improvements.

Our director has said that a whole seminar could be held on the topic of selection of case aides. I shall not attempt to go into the subject in detail here, but it is important to state our philosophy, which is that the use of case aides in our program is considered not only as a time-saving device for the trained caseworker, but as a recruiting device for the field of social work. With these objectives, it is hoped that the program may be as constructive an experience for the case aide as for the agency.

One of the important considerations in hiring a case aide is that she be interested in social work and be considering entering the field.

Each of the three case aides now in the agency is a college graduate. Each expressed an interest in social work, but for various reasons, immediate entrance into a graduate school on a full-time academic schedule was not practicable. In September 1955, all three of our case aides applied, and were accepted as part-time graduate students at one of the local graduate schools of social work. This registration was encouraged, by allotting one-half day per week to each case aide for academic work.

\* Delivered at New England Regional Conference, Boston, Mass., March 23, 1956.



We are a multi-service agency, with a diagnostic study home for children, three small group homes for adolescent youngsters, and a foster care department, including a boarding home program, service to unmarried mothers and adoptive placement planning. The boarding home program includes temporary emergency shelter care for small children.

### ***The "Desk Work" of a Case Aide***

This is a large variety of services for a young person to meet who is interested in social work, but not sure of the focus of her interest. Although we still speak facetiously of our case aides as "errand girls," and "the leg work department," the job of errand girl, no matter how glorified, could not hold the sincere interest of or offer any challenge to young women with the background and the ability demonstrated by our case aides. We try to plan the program for each case aide according to her interest and growing experience. With supervision and encouragement, added to their intelligent inquiry and enthusiasm, we find that they have developed into real aides to the entire agency.

Our case aides participate as members of our casework staff. Each has her desk in the department where she is working. One case aide is assigned to the group homes, two to the study home and foster care department. They attend staff meetings, diagnostic conferences and casework practice discussions in the agency.

They have regularly scheduled supervisory conferences. Their assignments come through the supervisor, except for certain routinely scheduled responsibilities. Caseworkers are asked to make requests for case aide service to the supervisor by the end of the week preceding the time the service is needed, whenever such early planning is possible. In conference with her supervisor, the case aide may bring up questions and discussions about procedure, problems which may come up, and problems which did come up during previous assignments. There is never enough time for all of it, and sometimes supervision is tucked around the edges of other activities

during the week. The case aides are also firm in a belief that "eavesdropping" is a constructive way of learning. By sharing an office with four caseworkers, they declare that they are acquiring a liberal education in telephone interviewing and some other casework techniques. Many other contacts with agency procedure are equally valuable, they agree, but this form of learning by listening seems to be especially painless.

We have a diagnostic study conference each Friday for consultation and planning for three children who have been in the study home for about six weeks. The first assigned responsibility of a case aide is the preparation of the social history summary for the study conference. Each case aide summarizes and presents the social history on one of these children. As preparation for this task, she "sits in" on a conference where a social history is presented, and staff reports, including medical, school, counselor, psychological, and psychiatric, and the plans for the child are discussed. She also is oriented about the confidentiality of the information, and an outline of the history to be selected. Most agencies may not have such a regularly scheduled need for case summaries, but case aides can competently secure and record needed information from records, and compile valuable summaries or abstracts for the various and numerous uses in most social agencies. And what a valuable learning experience it can be to review recorded processes and select significant material from case histories.

### ***Direct Contacts with Clients***

That sort of activity is the quieter side of life. At house staff meetings held weekly, counselors, study home caseworker, matron and director discuss together their common problems. Some of the children are in school, but the kindergarten counselor is a part of the staff meeting. What becomes of the kindergarten group? A case aide takes over as temporary counselor. Kids in groups are not new to her. She had camp counseling and settlement house experience in college. The youngsters know her because they see her

every day around the Home. She may have been sledding with them the day before, when a counselor with a sprained ankle could not go out. And tomorrow she may take one of them for a clinic visit.

There is always the clinic routine, particularly in any setting where children are in residence. In any foster care agency there is also the special medical care appointment. Our own pediatrician comes to the agency for at least an hour each day. But there are also the special tests such as EEGs, the EKGs, the audiometer test, the chest x-ray. Some agencies have nurses to escort children for such clinic visits, sometimes a volunteer may be used, often a child needs to be accompanied by his own caseworker, foster mother, or both, if the clinic visit is an anxious or unhappy time for him. But many clinic visits are pretty routine, even to the child concerned. One week recently, we had eleven outside clinic appointments scheduled for youngsters in the study home alone. These appointments, including transportation time, averaged about two and one-half hours each. That makes twenty-seven and one-half hours for clinic visits in one week. These trips are exclusive of those for haircuts, shopping for shoes or such other necessities. The one caseworker attached to the study home could not possibly carry all this alone! She does take the more upset youngsters, and the case aides, familiar persons to the children too, take the rest. We have a volunteer who aides the case aides sometimes. But when the case aide accompanies a child to clinic, the child goes with some one he knows, who is part of the staff of adults whom he is learning to trust. And the case aide has added knowledge regarding clinic resources, procedures and services that are part of her pre-professional experiences.

Most agency clothing closets are probably pretty much alike.

There are stacks of pastel flannel night gowns and receiving blankets, generously stitched by women's societies. There are boxes of diapers and baby shirts. And there are many boxes of used clothing in various sizes and states of repair, which usually fill the closet to the overflowing. The boxes of diapers disappear with amazing rapidity, the baby shirts get covered up with more used clothing, and the stacks of flannel gowns come

tumbling down whenever a harassed caseworker tries to find a pair of sox. Nobody could ever find anything in the clothing closet. And after a half hour of searching, the unhappy conclusion would be that someone took the last pair of sox or dozen diapers yesterday.

But times have changed at The New England Home for Little Wanderers. One of the earliest assignments, to the first case aide hired, was collecting layettes from the clothing closet for newborn babies to be placed from the hospital. After a few expeditions through the shambles, she tentatively suggested she might organize it. Now used clothing is neatly packed according to approximate size and sex, and under the case aide's watchful eye, diapers no longer become scarce commodities. One of her latest buying expeditions took her to Boston's wholesale district for special bargains in britches, both the absorbent and waterproof ones. Caseworkers no longer dash out for last-minute layette purchases, and foster mothers are not buying bibs while three dozen donated ones sit on a closet shelf.

Transportation time is considered a bugaboo by many child placement workers. The home visit may be becoming rare in family agencies, but in child placement, the home visit is still a useful tool, as well as a necessity. There are many trips that must be made by the caseworker, but there are some too, that can be delegated. Bringing a newborn from hospital to agency for pre-placement physical examination, driving a baby in from a foster home for a pre-adoptive psychological examination, meeting a child coming home from camp, when the caseworker is on vacation, are some of the dozens of transportation services case aides can do.

### **Cases Assigned to Aides**

Our case aides do carry cases, besides suitcases and donation boxes. These are not cases assigned to them just because we do not have enough trained caseworkers on the staff. They are cases selected for the case aide, because we feel that she can give the particular service to the client just as effectively as a trained worker could. In the process, she frees the trained worker's time for use where

professional skills are needed. She also has the experience of following through in a relationship with some continuity. What is more important as an introduction to casework?

Cases chosen for case aides generally fall into two groups—supervision of babies in foster homes, and placement of pre-school children referred for temporary shelter care. If a mother is still undecided about plans for herself and her baby after the baby is born, the caseworker continues regular casework contacts with the mother, following placement of the baby. Many times these mothers do not wish to visit the babies. In several such situations, we have assigned a case aide to place and supervise the baby in the foster home. This supervision includes primarily following the baby's development, and interpretations of agency policies to the foster mother. The aide's first graduate course was one in growth and behavior, and observation of an infant's development was an early assignment in the course. With Spock and Gesell as handy reference guides, in addition to a growing knowledge of agency policy and function, supervision of a baby in placement has given an opportunity to the case aide to have concrete experience in foster home visiting.

We also have a temporary shelter care service for young children. Shelter placement is often emergent, and there can be no careful preparation for the separation that must be made from parents and home. Mother suddenly must go to the hospital, there are no relatives or neighbors who can step in as substitute parents. Father is not in the home, or works such odd hours that housekeeping care is impossible. The school-aged child can become part of the group in the study home for a short-term placement. But pre-school children find the pace of the group too strenuous. If a young child must have care away from mother, we feel a family home is better than even a well-organized nursery. We have a group of foster mothers who are willing and very capable in caring for pre-school children, on brief notice, for short periods of time. Experienced intake workers are responsible for arranging with the parent

or the referring agency for the shelter requested. The intake worker discusses the plan with the parent, secures developmental history and a description of the child's present development and behavior.

In most of these situations, there is another agency working with the family, a hospital social worker active in the situation, or the family is an adequate unit except for the specific emergency which has precipitated the request for placement. The time-consuming part of the process is the arranging. These placements average about ten days each. The placement plan must include selection of a foster home, transporting the child to the home, introducing the child to the foster family, arranging with the referring agency or the parents for return of the child to his own home, calling for the child, bringing him to the agency pediatrician for a dismissal physical examination, and returning the child to his own home. Telescoped into a few days is a whole placement process. Preparation for placement is an on-the-spot affair, with worker comforting the frightened and lonely toddler, and explaining as simply but clearly as possible what is going to happen next—the physical examination, the ride in the car, the visit to another house, and the assurance that Mommy will come back. There is clothing to be checked. There are the many important details to be relayed to the foster mother about the child.

Does he still take a bottle to bed, does he have a favorite cuddle toy, what are his food fads, when does he nap, and what is his accustomed bedtime? Does he say "toidy," "potty," or does he use sign language to express his needs? Or is he only two, left alone by an alcoholic mother, and terribly frightened, with no predetermined schedule that can be followed to help him feel more secure in a strange place?

These are clients who do not respond to the most skillful interviewing technique. Warmth, assurance, and strong arms for refuge are the important tools of the moment. And we are finding that a case aide may supply these necessities more satisfactorily than a hurried caseworker, who may justifiably resent the time that such an emergency would take from a previously scheduled series of interviews.

In addition to supervision of babies in placement, and shelter care, one case aide, after a year of experience in the agency, has recently done some foster home studies. The initial interview with the applicants has been done by the home-finding worker. If the application seems a good one, and the family a sound one, the case aide, with close supervision from the home-finding worker, has proceeded with the home visits, meeting the family, and contacting references. The study is then reviewed by the foster care supervisor and the director, before the home is approved for use. The homes studied by the case aide have been foster homes for normal infants or toddlers, not homes considered as possibilities for children with special problems.

### ***Evaluating Case Aide Program***

Looking back, we can see things which we might have done differently. An intensive week of orientation might be considered with a new case aide. But we feel too that the "sink or swim" approach that we have used so far has been generally successful. We may have been fortunate in having strong case aides, but all have kept up with the current, and it is pretty swift sometimes.

We know now that a case aide can transport a baby, and can supervise a baby successfully in a foster home. But to have a case aide place a baby, when a caseworker will supervise the child following placement, though seemingly a time-saver, is not successful. The foster mother becomes confused about her worker and in the division of responsibility, some important details may be missed.

We know that great care must be taken in selecting cases in which the case aide takes responsibility for planning. An apparently simple shelter referral may develop into a complex placement situation, in which intensive casework is needed. We have found that in such situations, if a worker from another agency is already working with the parents, the case aide can well handle the inter-agency contacts. In a few instances we have needed to transfer a case from an aide to a caseworker, when intensive casework was indi-

cated. By early evaluation during the intake process, we hope to avoid such transfers in the future by making initially selective case assignments.

The plan that case aide assignments be made through the foster care supervisor is more effective than the original arrangement, when caseworkers made individual requests to the case aide for services. Supervisory conference time is still a problem. The case aides need, want and use supervision, but the one hour scheduled weekly for supervisory conference is not enough, and even that is sometimes postponed because of emergent requests for case aide services. The impromptu conferences are useful, but they are scattered and often less effective than the scheduled time. We are considering a weekly group conference with case aides and supervisor, and we know that more time for supervision will be an important addition to the program.

At the moment, I am wondering too, if we have over-planned our program for case aides. So many regular responsibilities have been found for them, that they have few free hours during the week to pick up the emergency requests from caseworkers, which we saw originally as one of their major activities. The aid they give to the caseworker has become less direct. Are we losing sight of one of our primary purposes in using case aides when regular responsibilities are assigned?

### ***Summary***

From our experience, we conclude that the case aides are valuable members of the agency team. The flexibility of their program and the continuity of their employment give them a unique position as helpers in a child care agency where flexibility and continuity rank high in importance, along with sensitivity and understanding.

But the position as case aide is not considered an ultimate goal, rather it is a stepping-stone to a goal. When a case aide is hired, she understands that her position is not a permanent one. She is employed for a one-year period. She may continue her em-



employment for a second or even a third year, if such a plan seems mutually beneficial to her and for the agency. But the position is not planned as a long-term employment opportunity. It is a valuable introduction to a field of social work. It is an opportunity to observe and learn through experience. The agency benefits from the services of the case aide, but has its responsibility too, to encourage the use of the program as a learning process.

We may see the ideal goal as the case aide's decision to go on to complete her professional training in social work, with a more certain direction of her interest in case-work, group work, or research. If a case aide decides through her experience that social work is not her field, this too is a valuable achievement, accomplished in time to prevent an unhappy or unproductive experience in professional education. And if the goal turns out to be marriage and family service on an individualized basis, the experience should not be a total loss. What valuable community interpretations of social agency services can be given by an individual well-oriented to agency functions. And we consider too, that the experience may well fit her to be a good board or committee member in the future.

Summing up, caseworkers may be expected to do everything at one time or another. Case aides can expect to be asked to do almost everything at any time.

### New League Members

Family and Children's Service Society, Inc.  
32 Henry Street  
Binghamton, N. Y.  
Perry J. Gangloff, General Secretary

Oak Grove  
100 Lackawanna Blvd.  
North Charleston, S. C.  
Everett Spell, Director

Child Adoption Service of the State Charities Aid Association  
105 E. 22nd Street  
New York, N. Y.  
Miss Amelia M. Igel, Director

## University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work



### PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and  
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

**A new Work-Study Program (Plan A)  
is announced to parallel the regular  
2-year program, (Plan B) for the  
Master of Social Work**

**The Doctorate program emphasizes  
teaching, research and administration**

## UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

The basic **Two-Year Graduate Curriculum** in social casework or social group work prepares for professional social work practice in all fields. It leads to the degree of Master of Social Work.

The **Advanced Curriculum** offers to qualified persons who hold a Master's degree in social work an advanced, third year of graduate professional education in social casework, group work, welfare organization, supervision, administration, teaching, or research. This curriculum leads to the Advanced Certificate.

The **Doctoral Curriculum** for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Social Work includes, and continues beyond, the Advanced Curriculum in any one of its specializations.

**Fellowships** are available to students in all curricula.

*Address all inquiries to:*

(MISS) MARGARET E. BISHOP

*Director of Admissions and Placement*

School of Social Work

University of Pennsylvania

2410 Pine Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

# UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN IN TODAY'S WORLD\*

**Benjamin Spock, M.D.**

Professor, Child Development  
Western Psychiatric Institute  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

*The author discusses in an inimitably graphic fashion the emotional needs of children. He suggests how these needs—of children in general as well as those being adopted—might best be treated not only with technical understanding, but especially with “humanness.”*

I WOULD like to begin by talking a little about children and what they need from us, starting with infancy and talking a little about what children seem like at different stages from an emotional point of view. Infancy seems by far the easiest to talk about. A baby spends at least three-quarters, maybe seven-eighths, of his time sleeping. It is probably good for his mother that he is willing to sleep that much while she is getting used to him. He wakes usually because he is hungry, and he is not just casually hungry, as you know; it is real hunger pain that wakes him, and he usually wakes up crying or within a few minutes he is crying. And when he is fed, it is not a casual matter either. To a baby, it is a life-and-death matter. At least the first six or nine months of infancy, he sucks so loud that you can hear him in the next room. He is likely to burst into a sweat by the time he is a quarter of the way through, and, as you know, by the time he is finished he is in a kind of stupor, with his mouth half open and the last few drops of milk dripping down his cheek.

It is a wonderful thing that we can now enjoy with him his feeding. I am sure that there are some readers who remember the days when pediatricians, in their efforts to eliminate the terrific death toll of babies which used to occur from diarrheal diseases, felt that you had to be not only very careful with a child, but exactly accurate about the hours, and the exact amount, of feeding. We have since spent a lot of time feeling regretful that we had to take exactness that strictly. We felt particularly badly for the baby. I think that there is every evidence that babies got through that first month or two, when

they were trying to adjust to the pediatrician's schedule, and could be reasonably well and turn out happy. But the person who really suffered was the mother of the occasional baby who did not adjust to the four-hour schedule, and she had to sit chewing her nails, pacing the floor, or looking at the clock. This was really tough on mothers, and it is most blessed that we have gotten convinced enough about the safeness of feeding so that pediatricians can actually tell mothers, “Feed the baby to suit yourself.”

## **Infants Need Love**

Now this is the more literal part of infancy, but, as you who work in the adoption field are well aware, we know that we need to highlight particularly the need of the baby for affection during the first year, especially that crucial second half of the first year, though it may well be that in a more subtle way the first half is just as important. We know clearly from evidence by those who help us to face this, such as Dr. Renee Spitz, Katherine Wolff and others, that the baby who is neglected the first year withers in body, withers in spirit, and withers in mentality. It is not just a general kind of attention or affection that babies need during the first year, but a very special kind, and I feel we should not be ashamed to call it doting. It is that feeling of slight gushiness in approaching a baby which is present not only in fond mothers and fathers, grandmothers and grandfathers, but in people who come casually upon the baby. It also occurs in the even rather stuffy, unhuman kind of people, who stop a mother with a baby carriage on the street, lean over and, after asking the first question or two—“How old is the baby? Is it a boy or a girl?”—have an irresistible impulse to lean over and sort of waggle their

\* Presented at CWLA National Conference on Adoption, January 1955, Chicago, Ill.

D\*

graphic suggests well as not only ally with

pediatrically well son who he occa- he four- wing her ne clock. and it is nvinced go that s, "Feed

rt of in- adoption e need to he baby specially st year, re subtle ant. We ose who ee Spitz, he baby thers in in men- of atten- ring the and I feel doting. s in ap- not only mothers no come rs in the people, riage on king the e baby? esistible gle their

heads from side to side and say something like "wuzza-wuzza-wuzza." The fact that this impulse comes so strongly in even the most unlikely people gives me the feeling it is almost instinctual for people to sense that a baby cannot find companionship, cannot shout from the crib, "Somebody pay attention to me." People sense that the baby has to lie there waiting for people to feel doting, and doting means making it absolutely clear to the baby, not only with a word, but with exaggerated smiles, the wagging of the head, that they really are bringing their affection to him.

### When Child Learns to Walk

The next period—one to three—in some respects sharply differs. Suddenly the child learns to walk, and with this everything changes. It is not just that he has motility; it is that he develops this fantastic energy that goes with his capacity for motility. It is the point clearly when the baby rather suddenly begins to realize: "Say, I'm a separate person." He was not at all clear about this before. Suddenly he realizes:

"This is my body; this is my life; I have wishes; I have a will of my own; I have a dignity of my own."

And he seems to realize that he must establish it in his mother's mind and in his mind very clearly before he can go on to the next stage of development. You know the areas in which he tries to establish this. The first is in eating. At six months and nine months he was willing to take everything his mother fed him. Suddenly, somewhere around the age of ten or twelve or fourteen months, he realizes: "Why do I just take what she offers to me?" This is a matter of his choice. And it is not only disconcerting, it is really irritating to the mother, because she knows that it is not because he is firmly opposed to this thing—last week he ate reasonably well of it. And all of a sudden his attitude is: "I'll have nothing to do with it."

Another area where trouble arises is in the matter of toilet training. This may be a child whose toilet training was started at six or seven months and went perfectly easily. A

child, as long as things happen, and in a fairly regular way, seems to have no objection to letting them happen on the kind of apparatus that the mother chooses. But at one, one and a quarter, surely by one and a half, he suddenly realizes:

"These are my insides; these are my bowel movements, and what was I doing letting this woman tell me exactly when and exactly where?"

The poor guy has not yet had enough experience to figure just when or where he would like to do it. The only thing that he is sure of is that he does not want to have it imposed on him. So you know what happens.

The mother says: "He stays sometimes five minutes, or forty-five minutes, and nothing happens." And you ask: "When does it happen?" And she says: "Well, it's a funny thing. It happens just exactly as soon as he gets up." She adds: "I think he's forgotten what it's all about."

It seems to me absolutely clear that he has forgotten nothing, that he has rather reached a stage where he must assert himself in this respect also, and the only way he can do so is to say "At least not at the time that she chooses," even though it may take some effort to hold it in until she is willing to let him off the apparatus.

It comes up in regard to practically all the minor issues of the day, with some major ones thrown in here and there.

The mother says: "Let's go out to the park." And going out to the park is his favorite occupation of the day. But he says, "No." He does not mean, "No, I don't want to go out to the park." He means: "Now, wait a minute. I have to help decide this thing." In olden days, mothers knew exactly what to do when a child got out of hand; they got mad, or they got a little more bossy, or they smacked the child on the behind. Nowadays it is infinitely more complicated, because the mother has the feeling: "The pediatrician may be looking over my shoulder, or some psychologist or some future psychiatrist is looking over my shoulder." The mother has to keep asking herself: "What should I do? Am I entitled to get firm?"

I think this is one of the ways we have let modern parents down, in making the whole business seem too technical and making parents feel so ignorant that they are constantly dashing back and forth in their minds, trying to think of what they are permitted to do under these somewhat trying circumstances. As a matter of fact, what the baby most needs at this age is reasonable understanding and tactfulness, but this does not come easily

to a mother with her first child, who has been completely led astray after the first year into thinking that he will always be as agreeable as he was during the first year. By the time she has had two or three, she knows the worst of every aspect of development, and has somehow or other found techniques for managing it.

### ***Children Less Tense During Ages 3-6***

The next period from three to six is a relatively easy one for parents. The child has acquired, by the age of about three, a general positive feeling toward the parents.

The age period of from three to six is when children are really fundamentally devoted admirers of their parents and any other adults, when the child is willing to act half-way human when around children. At this age period, they are quite willing to be friendly even to the pediatrician who has tried to be reasonable with them. It is a glowing kind of admiration that they have. They come up to you smiling, as if to say:

"You must be one of those wonderful adults. Let me in a little on the details of what interesting things you have to offer."

They come and lean against the person whose looks they like. I know that they are not angels, but my feeling would be that if a parent cannot enjoy this age period it is really too bad, because there is no other age period when they look at you with the same expression on their faces. So it would seem to me that what they are asking of their parents is a model of something to enjoyably copy, something to make an ideal pattern of.

There is a subdivision of this, for at this age the boy gets a much clearer idea than he had at two, that he is of the male sex, that it is his destiny to become a man, and somehow this makes manly things more and more exciting and challenging to do. So he gradually gives up his nondifferentiated kind of play and progressively turns to things that are boyish in his particular neighborhood or country. And girls at the same period get the idea, for the first time: "I'm going to be a woman." And this is what makes them find

mothers such exciting people, and copy them. Mother does not have to be a perfect example, and there does not have to be perfect harmony between girl and mother. There only has to be a reasonably good relationship for this powerful process or pattern to set in.

Other things we have learned from psychiatry and nursery school observations of children show clearly that their fundamental attitudes toward their own sex and their future place in the world, are laid down at this period, although not in an unchangeable way. And, as you know, the parent of the opposite sex does not get left out at this exciting time. This is the age when the boy realizes who is the most important woman in the world, the most beautiful woman, the most adorable woman, and there is absolutely no question in his mind that his mother is it. If you are foolish enough to try to argue with a child at this age, if he tells you he is going to marry his mother when he grows up, and say:

"Look, it isn't that way. When you get a little older, you'll find another girl your same age, who you'll think is wonderful,"

there is complete incredulity on the face of the child when he hears this kind of talk. He replies: "I'm going to marry my mother when I grow up." Because all the other girls which have been sketched in for him seem vague and colorless and unimportant, compared to her. It is not that he is going to marry someone who is an exact replica, but certainly the kind of relationship they have between them will have a most powerful influence on the kind of relationship he will look for when the time comes.

### ***6-12 Period Complicated***

In the six-to-twelve period, it is as if nature says:

"I'm sorry. It was a mistake to get that much attached to your parents. You'll have to turn around now, and try to undo some of it."

And the child seems to be driven, first of all, by the feeling that it is in the outside world that the challenging pattern exists now.

"What do the other guys wear?" "What do the other guys say?" "How do the other guys get along with each other?" "What are their manly ideals?"



It becomes a serious business to him to find his place in the outside group. It would be nice if he could turn his interest to the outside world and, just in a pleasant, positive way, go on to this. But he cannot unhitch himself that easily from his parents. Whether or not they have gotten hold of him too much, he seems to feel that he is too much gotten hold of, and he feels the necessity for actively pushing his parents away. And this is what makes this at least a gritty period.

There is no question about it but that he is, at least in a vague, unconscious kind of way, deliberately trying to be irritating. You know the kind of things I mean, the kicking at the table leg during meals, the fact that when he comes in from outdoors he plops his coat in the middle of the living room, or at least in the middle of his bedroom floor. He wants to be dirty. It was not that at an earlier age period he wanted to be clean, but he was willing to be clean at the three-to-six period. But now it is a matter of principle to be dirty, because to be clean is too clearly what his parents want. This is not an age period, however, when a child is ready for independence, for all you have to do is scratch the surface a little to see that he is still very much his parents' child about all important things, such as moral values, standards, religion. The feud against those things comes later, the conscious, idealistic rebellion that comes in adolescence.

In this period, however, it is a symbolic rebellion. The child wisely takes things which he knows are not of great importance to the family, nor important as ideals to fight against. Turning to the outside world, he is ready to be impressed not only by what his friends of the same age think, but by what adults on the outside think. He senses that he is not old enough, all by himself, to knock down all his parents' ideas, or to argue them out of their position. He needs allies, and will take almost any allies he can find in the way of respectable adults and try to use them against his parents. I remember when my youngest son was in the first grade he used to say at least twenty times a day: "Miss Hickey says. . . ." Miss Hickey was, of

course, his teacher, and we could see he was warning us:

"I've found that there are other people in this outside world who are knowledgeable adults, too, and whose ideas don't always agree with yours."

At times, the child has to distort what people in the outside world say, too, in order to refute the parents' position.

### ***Influence of Outside World***

What I am leading up to is that adults in the outside world, at church, Sunday school, and particularly teachers in school, really have an important role to play in the child's life, because we know now that their job is not simply to get hold of some subject matter and try to pour it any way they can get it into them. We know that the child is looking for at least surface ideals from these outside people. We know that it is important that the teacher be a well-selected person with good personality, who likes children and feels comfortable and secure with them. It is important that classes are not too big, and that teachers have been trained in a way to use the curriculum for character building, and realize that this is in their grasp, to a degree. It is terribly important for a teacher to know that it is not morality she teaches, or that mottoes will not change the child's character or attitude about important things, but it is the atmosphere she creates in the classroom, and what she allows or encourages the children to practice in the relationship with her and with each other. This is what the child is already looking for and is quite ready to mold himself after. We know that the teacher who is a friendly person is able to increase during the school year the amount of friendliness in a class, and that a teacher who is an unfriendly person manages to create unfriendliness, taken out at recess, on the way home, and with the parents after the child gets home.

It is not exactly the point here to talk about schools. But since you are a group of people concerned with children, I think it is important for you to realize your responsibility to make yourselves heard during these

days. Schools in many parts of the country are a disgrace, and they are inadequate almost everywhere. There is every certainty that they are going to get increasingly inadequate, and we are not doing nearly enough about it. We know that in this country much more is spent on cosmetics than on public education, liquor than on public education, and on tobacco than on education.

### ***Being a Good Parent***

Now the main point I am trying to make about the various stages of childhood is that although there are different aspects of what children need from parents at different age periods, let us say predominantly doting during the first period; predominantly tactfulness during the second period; taking it easy, relatively speaking, in the three-to-six period; needing a new definite understanding and tactfulness and willingness for the child to detach his allegiance, to some degree, as he gets into the next age period—that these are not different kinds of parents who can use different things at different age levels. Parents need to sense the need to dotingness and to enjoy doting during the first year, to be able to quietly enjoy the little expressions of independence and autonomy that the baby insists on during the second and third years. These are all ways of being good parents, and this is not entirely different from the kind of love and affection that we have for different adults. We do not have to be told by books and lectures how to manage and how to get along with different adults whom we know. Intuitively, if we like people, we keep shifting the aspect we present, and when we are with stuffy, conventional people, we tone ourselves down right away and present this to them. When we get with some other friends, we relax a little and bring out our lustier side. This is not anything that has to be learned. It is not technical. It is the way human beings behave if they like people.

Now I come to a crucial stage—what this may have to do with adoption. It seems to me, as we have learned in parental child care, that it is not by reading books or being taught that people become good parents. It

is not necessary for someone to tell them how to give medicine and how to make a formula, except for the first time.

Generally speaking, ninety-nine per cent of what parents do for their children does not come from what is learned; rather, it comes spontaneously from within. You know where it comes from, basically from the way they were brought up as children, and they were brought up this way by kindly parents and loved their parents. All this gets built into childhood, so that by the time they become parents themselves they have all the feelings there automatically to take good care of their children.

One of the things which we who have been working professionally in the whole business of child care—pediatricians, educators, psychologists—have inadvertently done is to upset this nice system to some degree, especially among the less certain parents. We have, to some degree, at least, robbed some of them of their spontaneity, and anybody who has tried bringing up children by rules that come from somebody else knows that it is an absolutely impossible system. I hope that in the next ten to fifteen years in parent-education work we keep this absolutely in focus—that all we will help parents do is to do more easily what they would do anyway, rather than try to persuade them to do something different, no matter how convinced we are that the different thing is technically better.

### ***A Human Approach to Adoption***

One way of looking at what is happening in a conference like this, is that we are learning that the important things are the basic human elements in us, and the basic human elements in the clients we are dealing with and in the children we are trying to place. We have learned that the technical aspects are somewhat dangerous, that we are inclined to latch onto things too avidly at first, and then find that we latched onto them with insufficient knowledge. Then with some embarrassment we have to abandon these and change our procedures.

I am thinking of the much earlier days in adoption, when much stress was laid on the hygienic aspects of the home. Was it socially hygienic, and did the prospective father ever take a drink? Did the parents go to church

regularly? In those days it was thought that these external and more technical aspects of home life were the important things. It did not take us long to find that, no, this is not what makes for happy childhood. It is wonderful if these aspects are there, and these qualities are often a sign of good parents, but there is no necessary correlation between them.

More recently, we have been worrying about heredity and about testing. I thought that the most exciting thing I heard Dr. Boyd McCandless say was:

In most cases children born to mothers, whose IQ's are between forty and eighty, if placed in an average adoptive home, would have a mean intelligence, as tested later, of over one hundred. This is not to say, of course, that it is better to be born of a mother with an IQ between forty and eighty, because children born of mothers whose IQ's are higher come out even higher. There is a little something in heritage of IQ, but it is so small that we need not worry that we are slipping an idiot to a good adoptive couple by offering them a child who otherwise seems healthy, just because the parent's IQ was low or unknown.

All the other aspects about inheritance affect relatively few cases. A few need to be taken into account when we know of questionable inheritance in a family, but these make relatively few cases as against the frequent child whose natural mother has a low IQ or a somewhat dubious IQ.

For a number of years we have known that we have been, to a large degree, barking up the wrong tree and worrying about what tests would show during infancy. I think we are all pretty comfortable now that those tests have value. The developmental tests have value particularly in telling what has happened up to the point of the test, for instance, of a severe birth injury. Also, a sensitive reader of a good test can even tell whether the child has been grossly neglected from an emotional point of view. I think we are all pretty clear now that a test, aside from showing gross disturbances in the past, has no bearing whatsoever on what the child's IQ will be later. In other words, roughly speaking, in an overwhelming majority of cases there is no connection between developmental test results in infancy and the IQ.

What have we found? We have found this distressing fact, and in stewing about such

things as proof of the child's normal development we have ourselves played at least some part inadvertently, with all our conscientiousness, in keeping children from getting into the adoptive homes in which they have the very best chances of developing intelligence to the full. What we are really saying is that some of these technical aspects are utterly unimportant when compared to the straight, human qualities that we are talking about in babies and in adoptive parents. But I am not saying that we have found that such things as technical knowledge, technical services, and professional attitudes on the part of the workers are unimportant.

### *Integrating New Advances*

I am sure we all agree that enormous advantages have come from technical advances. Certainly this is true in medicine, even at a time when we are trying to get more "humanness" into medicine. And I am sure that we will continue specifically in the adoption field to need the help of experts and know how to use them—the anthropologists, lawyers, obstetricians, psychiatrists, geneticists—but I think we are learning to know what their place is, and that it does not take the place of the primary focus on the important human aspects of adoption.

When we have been so fooled in the past, how are we to know in the future whether we are getting ourselves into trouble by over-enthusiasm in technical advances? It would seem to me that one rule might be that every time we acquire a new technique we scramble over our list of present techniques to see if there is one that, in view of the advance of knowledge, we can throw away. The point I am making is that these accretions keep being added to procedure, and no one is in a position to cry out to question. I think the trouble we have everywhere is trying to get children to child guidance clinics, and one of the troubles is that in a good child guidance clinic, every child who goes there gets the full battery of tests and has hours and hours of the social worker's, psychologist's and psychiatrist's attention; so that this place

will be proud of its diagnostic work-up. Its wish is to be this thorough, but it completely ignores the problem of the hundreds of people who cannot get into the clinic.

I think what I am trying to say is that every time you get entrenched behind a new technique, or every time you get entrenched behind a new professional attitude, it may be necessary to ask: "Are you evading something that may be more properly your own responsibility?" You are always wanting someone else to give you a more special answer, or is it a matter of timidity, which is a subdivision of evasion? Or is it a kind of stand-offishness? I am really thinking of this stand-offishness most of all, for every time we creep behind a technique or professional attitude there is the danger that we are trying to get people away from us a little farther, so that we can manage them in a more at-arm's-length kind of way. Sometimes this manner is used to cover some of our own feelings which we are unable to face.

It seems to me that in much of our professional work we try to tell people one thing, while our manner is telling them something entirely different. One of the things I have wondered about is: What does the investigation period mean to people who have applied for a child for adoption? It would seem to me that it cannot help meaning to them that they are being scrutinized, that they are to some degree being criticized, and that the words in which you tell them that this is routine are not important. The important thing is whether you can really feel that this is not a critical business, can you feel friendly with them? I think we learn as professional people, after a while, that it is possible, after you get over some of the limitations of your own feelings, to feel friendly with adoptive applicants, and it should be possible in the investigation period to like people, even though you have to say "absolutely no" to them as adoptive parents.

There is just one other thing that I wish to include before ending. Is there any way we can keep track of ourselves as to whether we are slipping into too professional or too technical an aspect in our work? I think one little

rule that may have some application is: How much jargon are we falling into? This is often a good indication. I have to teach medical students this, especially when, after they have gotten a certain amount of training during the first year, they come in and describe a child to me this way: "This is a well-developed, well-nourished male, in apparently good health, apparently of stated age." This is a way of saying that here is a husky, healthy ten-year-old boy. Of course, as soon as I hear this, I begin tearing into the medical student, and say:

"Maybe it is necessary in some exercises, sir, to talk this way. But while you are at this health center, do not be afraid to say: 'He is a nice, healthy ten-year-old boy.'"

If, after a week's work with him, he is still talking about well-nourished, well-developed males, I realize that he is a lost soul. He has prematurely ossified, and I do not know what I can do for him.

### Mr. Reid Answers Miss Buck

The June issue of *Woman's Home Companion*, on the newstands May 17, will contain a "battle page" on adoption with material by Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director of the League, and Miss Pearl Buck. The article is entitled "The Battle Over Children for Adoption," and contains a series of answers by Mr. Reid to questions posed by the magazine. The "battle page" idea was agreed to by the magazine after it had announced it would carry a second article by Miss Buck on the subject. After representations by the League, the magazine agreed to make equal space available to Mr. Reid in the form of answers to questions they prepared. This portion is headed "Why You Can't Adopt The Child You Want." Miss Buck's article is entitled "We Can Free The Children."

### National Conference of Social Work

May 20-25

St. Louis Auditorium, St. Louis, Mo.

Chairman: Mr. Anthony DeMarinis, Executive Director  
Family and Children's Service  
St. Louis, Mo.

League's Headquarters—Hotel Statler



# ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISION vs. CONSULTATION

**Edith S. Baxter**

Training Consultant, Bureau of Child Welfare  
New York State Department of Social Welfare  
Albany\*

*The subject of this article is one aspect of social work administration—the choice of the method by which a standard-setting agency works toward improving direct services to clients, by helping its operating members to desire and to achieve goals for improving the quality of service. The method discussed is administrative supervision as contrasted with consultation. The way in which the supervisor operates and the reaction of the local agency will be discussed in two subsequent articles.*

IMPROVEMENT of standards of service is a generally accepted responsibility of public welfare administration. However, because the standard-setting agency has basic legal responsibility for maintaining adherence to minimum requirements, the staff who work toward improvement of service are sometimes regarded as extra to the agencies' normal functions. Consultant or similar title is often given such staff members. This raises two vital questions: one, what is the consultant's function, and the other, what help is needed in the special situation. In a good many agencies, the title of consultant is applied to staff who are experts in a specialty or have in-service training responsibility or both. Because such staff are employed to assist in improving services of the operating units beyond what is accepted as the required minimum, their function has often been thought of as not indispensable. This view tends to prevent their being invested with administrative authority even when such authority might appropriately be theirs, and

leads to attempts to use consultants in administrative capacities not compatible with their real function.

The experience we will present is the evolution of a loosely-defined consultant position to one of administrative supervisor. That supervision was introduced for the adoption service, is only incidental. It could equally well be for any type of children's service.

## **Problem Recognized on State Level**

Our ultimate goal was that adequate adoption service may be given by all local public welfare agencies in New York State, to "complement and supplement adoption services of the private agencies,"<sup>1</sup> so that every child who needs a home by adoption will have opportunity to be placed.

Adoption began to emerge as an area of service needing the special concern of the Department about fifteen years ago. The need for use of more precise professional skills, for better and more help to the own parent prior to and at the point of separation, our concern about unauthorized placements and laws affecting adoption, continue to be important today. The significant change came a few years later as the field began to realize the number of children with no permanent ties who never "achieved adoption," and the number of couples whose capacity for parenthood was not being used.

\* The New York State public welfare program is state-supervised, locally administered. There are 66 public welfare districts, each with responsibility for administering a complete welfare program including service and care for children. The State Department of Social Welfare maintains policy-making and general administrative offices in Albany, the state capitol. Administrative supervision of the local agencies is delegated to five Area Offices and an Office of New York City Affairs. Policies mentioned in the article apply to New York City equally with the other districts, but the program described has been developed only in the upstate and suburban Areas.

<sup>1</sup> *Social Welfare in New York State in 1954* 88th Annual Report, State Department of Social Welfare, Legislative Document (1955) No. 59, August 1, 1955, Albany, N. Y.—p. 1.

The Department kept pace with the trends in the field in its work with the local public welfare departments for whose standards of child care it has legal responsibility. Its emphasis, at that time, was to make the local agencies aware of some of the implications of adoption and the existence of accepted minimum standards. The manual for local child welfare workers advised that for these reasons, as well as to provide placement away from the local district, children be referred to specialized voluntary agencies for adoptive placement. It seemed that many more years of effort to improve personnel qualifications and of in-service training in basic casework principles should precede giving the agencies help in placement for adoption. Voluntary agencies, meanwhile, gave as much service as possible, and in their contacts with local departments contributed to training the staffs. Nevertheless, only the agencies themselves could identify those children in their case loads who should have adoptive placement. Only the agencies could work with the own parents with respect to surrender, study the children and begin to prepare them.

The Department's growing awareness that some children might miss the opportunity for adoption was expressed in the advice that case loads should be reviewed regularly to identify them.

### ***Local Awareness of the Problem***

About the mid 1940's, it was becoming apparent through surveys, statistical reports, and field visits that even though children were not overlooked, many were not being placed because voluntary agency services were insufficient and the public agencies were still unable to give adequate service. At a meeting late in 1945, a voluntary adoption agency supervisor encouraged more child welfare workers to handle adoption in their own counties to meet the gaps in voluntary agency services and to discourage unauthorized placements.

So inspired did the leaders of the group become, that they decided to survey the adoption services, asking the Department to

assist in preparing and tabulating the material. The responses from the seventeen counties in the Area showed rather strikingly that a number of children who were on referred to private agencies had no immediate prospect of placement, and that no adoption plan was contemplated for a larger number although they were considered available for adoption.

The leaders of the supervisory group soon came to the conclusion that the only answer was more adoption service to be given directly by the public agencies—but how? Some were conscious of lack of training and skill; others saw the problem as chiefly one of insufficient staff and large case loads for which there seemed no solution. They proposed that the counties join together in employing a qualified worker, to whom five counties would refer for study adoptive home applications. The worker would have authority to approve or reject homes, but the final decision as to placement of children in these homes would be made by the counties in accordance with their legal responsibility. The supervisors of the employing counties would serve as an advisory committee.

### ***Response of State Department***

The agencies asked if the state could provide a worker. The Department recognized the possibility of doing so as a demonstration financed through Federal Child Welfare Services funds, and thought that through a demonstration of a year or so, the waiting children would be placed, a reserve of approved homes would be established and the agencies would have learned more about the adoption job. If the need proved to be a continuing one, perhaps some arrangement for joint local employment could then be worked out or some of the counties might be able to add adoption workers to their staffs. In short, to the Department, the situation offered an opportunity to assist in improving services in response to a genuine expression of need.

Through a request to the U.S. Children's Bureau for approval of the State's plan for the new use of Federal funds and through search for a worker the Department began to

supplement the plan. By the time the worker was appointed, early in 1948, there had been some change in the Department's view of the project. Its own further thinking and that of the Children's Bureau was that in-service training to assist the agencies to do the job themselves was preferable to doing it for them even as a demonstration. An experiment in Pennsylvania further influenced the revision of the project.

### ***From Demonstration to Consultation***

Retrospective consideration has shown us the Department's dilemma. The project became a part of its own administrative function. This meant that the service would come to the local agencies from outside, endowed with the Department's authority, rather than as their own creation, while it had started as something wanted by the agencies not initiated by the Department. To preserve as much as possible of the originally contemplated structure, the Department gave the "demonstration worker" a different function, more akin to consultation. The sponsoring group of five counties was convened and the changes were presented to it by one of the commissioners, who accepted the Department's point of view. Although approval was voted at the next meeting, the first at which the new worker was present, some of the group raised objections which had to be ironed out. Subsequently, the Department sent an explanatory statement to each of the five commissioners and the plan was accepted in effect, though with some remaining reluctance. The most vigorously stated objection was that the agencies' problem was not one of inability of the local workers but of lack of staff, and therefore help with the job to be done, not training for it, was what was needed. Many commissioners at that time found it more difficult than at present to ask their local appropriating bodies for increased staffs as recommended by the Department, despite state reimbursement on administrative costs,<sup>2</sup> and case loads were generally too high.

<sup>2</sup> 80% at that time; 50% since program coverage of reimbursement has been extended.

The Adoption Worker found herself in the difficult position of attempting to satisfy the local agencies' concept of her function and at the same time creating a desire for her services as training specialist. Her duties, as agreed by the sponsoring group and the Department, included the immediate developing of procedures for an inter-county adoption exchange, making a demonstration home study and placement for each agency, visiting the agencies for individual case consultation and general training, and planning for outside experts to lead meetings and institutes on adoption. The Department placed upon her responsibility for interpretation and development of a program. She was herself responsible, however, to one of the Department's Area administrative supervisors, and the position was defined in such a way that she was limited strictly to casework matters considered relevant to adoption. In practice, this meant that administrative problems such as staffing or recording, and allied casework areas such as pre-adoptive boarding home care or even work with unmarried mothers, were excluded from her field of concern. Because of the reluctance of some of the original group of supervisors to be personally involved in in-service training, the worker was able to give training only as case consultation was requested. She could read only the records which the agencies selected for her, and give consultation only on those cases, not on program and policy. Although many of the casework concepts basic to adoption were not new intellectually to the supervisors and their workers, they were new as part of their own practice. Inevitably, consideration of the implications of some of these concepts presented difficulties for them.

The accomplishment of that first year was considerable in spite of these problems, because of the Adoption Worker's skill and the real wish of many of the local staffs to learn. The Exchange was established so soundly that it provided the pattern for later development state-wide. The Exchange plan was predicated on trust of the agencies in one another's work, trust which had to come not

merely from acceptance of uniform procedures but of the same casework principles. The Worker pointed out to the Department that although there was a slow but definite increase in the number of children for whom adoption was considered and who were actually placed, faster progress was blocked on the one hand because by the definition of her job she was precluded from giving help early enough in many cases, and from helping to work out required agency policies, and because of administrative problems within the agencies which impeded their own progress, especially too heavy case loads. Although her comments on staffing and case loads were available to other members of the Department staff, they were not always included in recommendations to local agencies.

### ***Evaluation Results in New Plan***

By the end of the first year, there was enough success to justify extension of the project and at the same time the possibility was seen of extension on the basis of a somewhat different plan.

The first experience had shown that the Adoption Worker would have to find the children for whom adoption should be considered by case reading if she were to help the agencies move at the earliest possible point. In order to provide effective training, she needed also a broad understanding of the level of their work and their particular problems. The demonstration showed that there were complications if agencies became involved in Exchange participation before they were able to operate from a common base in casework practice, and that interest in Exchange activities and procedures could be a distraction from focus on improving their own practices. It was decided therefore that in the new Areas the introduction of Exchange would be a later development.

Despite the obvious advantage of having an expressed need on which to build, it proved equally advantageous to introduce the Department's plan where no request for help had been made. It was therefore announced to the second group of agencies that an Adoption Project like that operating

successfully in one Area, would now be introduced in theirs. The Department decided to begin with one agency which was known to be administratively sound, receptive to help from the Department, but where the adoption work was inadequate despite the agency's best efforts. When officially informed, the agency selected was pleased and participated actively in working out specific plans, in conferences at first with the Department's regular staff, and later with the Adoption Worker.

The objective of making adoption possible for more children was highlighted at the start by the emphasis on case reading. The Department's Bureau of Research and Statistics had provided the Worker with a list of all children in the care of the agency under seven years of age. A copy of the list<sup>3</sup> was given to the county child welfare supervisor during the field visit in which the Area Office staff member introduced the Adoption Worker. Before the next visit, the supervisor had opportunity to bring the list up-to-date, and to prepare the records and her own comments. The Adoption Worker used the list to plan her reading and to prepare for recording her findings.

The Worker then proceeded, through her reading, not only to find potentially adoptable children but to identify problems in the agency's work. The next step, assistance with the particular cases and more general training, was through individual and staff conferences. A demonstration home study and placement were made. Casework with unmarried mothers also had been agreed upon as part of the Worker's responsibility, and it was possible to provide a demonstration of this service.

The other counties in the Area had been included in the Department's planning from the beginning. Meetings of the child welfare supervisors were held periodically to keep them interested and informed and to acquaint them in general with good practices in adoption. One by one, as rapidly as seemed

<sup>3</sup> These lists are compiled from the admission reports local agencies are required to make to the Department, and give basic social information, including reason for admission.



wise to the Department, other counties were selected for participation, following the same pattern for introducing this supervision. Exchange was developed in the Area after all the agencies had received preliminary training. This intensive preparation seems to have been a factor in its becoming the most active Exchange in the state.

Administratively, the Adoption Worker was still subject to some limitations. Although she did not have administrative supervisory responsibilities she continued to receive strong administrative backing from the Department's Area staff. She referred to the Area staff most problems, such as program, policy, and staffing, which came up. But since she was able to communicate with that staff readily, the matters she referred received appropriate attention. She had an increasing part in the consideration of the Department's approach to the needs of each local agency.

### ***Further Experiment***

Meanwhile, there were other developments in the statewide program. Three more counties accepted the invitation to join the first five in the project and Exchange. Almost simultaneously a third group of agencies was added, and plans set up for "training and consultation" in good child welfare practices with special emphasis on adoption, but without the case finding approach. The services of the Exchange were eventually made available here on an optional basis, upon requests for homes for children with special needs, as well as for referral of unused homes.

"Adoption Consultant" became the working title of all three workers during the next year, emphasizing that consultation and training rather than direct service was their function. The plan of a demonstration study and placement for each county was continued for a time in the first two Areas, but eventually dropped. At the beginning of the third year, the Department and the original group of five counties decided to extend to all the other counties in the Area an invitation to join. The initial case-reading plan was designed

as the method to be used. However, although four more counties accepted and were given considerable service, the plan for case reading as they entered the project was not completely followed.

Another stage of progress was reached with the further extensions of the project in which the Department set the pattern. The Department realized increasingly the need to relate the work in adoption more closely to its total effort to improve child welfare practices. The fourth Adoption Consultant's assignment included administrative review of the adoption work of counties which were scheduled for regular Department surveys, and assistance to certain counties in formulating and writing their adoption policies, all in close collaboration with the Area staff. It was then decided that the "adoption aspect" of the Department's surveys of local agencies would be conducted routinely by the Adoption Consultants. The difficulty with this plan proved to be that the agencies scheduled for surveys were not necessarily those which would otherwise have been selected for the attention of the Adoption Consultant at the particular time. Too, the survey process called for another kind of evaluation, and the case sampling did not necessarily reveal which children were most in need of attention, nor provide a basis for training. Furthermore obtaining and writing up the material to meet survey deadlines cut seriously into the time for the Adoption Consultant's work with other agencies and coordination of the Exchange. Consequently, after about a year this plan was dropped by Department decision.

### ***From Consultant to Administrative Supervisor***

In evaluating this project the Department found that staff changes left three rather than four Areas covered, with only one having had enough continuous service from the same consultant to have benefited by her help. For the rest, the work continued to be influenced by the self-determined basis on which it had begun.

The Department's criterion was the extent to which consideration for adoption was available to all children needing it, the amount of adoption activity including home-finding, the quality of casework practice, and the influence of the project on local administrative policies. Objectives had changed, resulting in a sense of urgency in the Department on behalf of the children still untouched by the new program. The second Area project was the most successful from the Department's point of view and also from the agencies'. It was having a valuable influence on the local child welfare practices of the Area. The professional leadership through which these results were being achieved, with its base in Department administrative support, was evidently administrative supervision plus training.

Consequently, two steps were taken. The whole Department and all the local agencies in the state were alerted by the Commissioner<sup>4</sup> to the need to improve and extend adoption services, especially by building up staffs adequate in number and in skill. The second and equally important step on the basis of six years' experience was the formal change of the title of Consultant to "Supervisor of Social Work, Adoptions." The Civil Service grade had previously been raised. An administrative directive was issued stating

"We now believe that the adoption work is more soundly regarded as a program activity of the Department, that is, a part of the job to be done through Area Office supervision rather than a function primarily of training and consultation."<sup>5</sup>

It was made clear that the Department would determine the form the Adoption Supervisors' work would take. The counties where the agency's adoption work seemed inadequate would be selected. Since not more than two counties could receive intensive service simultaneously the Department would

<sup>4</sup> Through receipt of copies of a letter from Commissioner Raymond W. Houston to Mayors and Chairmen of Boards of Supervisors, May 12, 1954, asking public support for adequate adoption services.

<sup>5</sup> The administrative directive was a memorandum from Antonio A. Sorieri, Deputy Commissioner, to Area Directors, sent December 6, 1954 on the subject of "Policy on Adoption Supervision." Copies of this are obtainable from the League office.

decide the priorities. The Adoption Supervisor would have a "free hand" to study anything which she considered to have a bearing on the agency's adoption work in addition to the original list of cases. She would then formulate her recommendations and, in conference, she and the Area staff together would decide whether to continue to work with the agency and in what way, or whether some basic administrative changes were necessary. The Area staff and Adoption Supervisor would present the findings to the local commissioner and case supervisor and explain the plan advised by the Department. In most agencies intensive training and program supervision by the Adoption Supervisor would follow. Those agencies would then form the nucleus of the Area's Exchange and make use of the inter-Area Exchange as needed.

The last two Adoption Supervisors appointed have started work on this basis. The service is now operating in each of the Department's five Areas (outside New York City). The Area identified above as the second, which through its experience suggested the basic pattern, has continued its rate of progress. The two which began with the self-determined pattern have had some difficulty in changing. In these Areas there appears to be less adoption activity and the Department cannot be as certain of knowing that children are having adoption consideration as needed. Work with a different emphasis has now been started in two new agencies in each Area.

### *In Conclusion*

The experience discussed here points up how important it is, in a program for improving services, to determine what is involved in that effort and what staff function is required. It is appropriate for a standard-setting agency to employ consultant staff to serve its own staff and those of its constituents who are able to use such service. However, when the operating unit cannot evaluate its own need when essential services are involved the standard-setting agency's responsibility toward clients can be met only through administrative supervision of the operating unit. This authoritatively-based approach gives the operating agency the help it needs in facing the problem, and in carrying out its responsibility.

## READERS' FORUM

### *Therapeutic Group Living*

DEAR EDITOR:

Mrs. Elliot Studt's article which suggests a conceptual framework for the further exploration of the "Therapeutic Factors in Group Living"\* was provocative and stimulating. There were a few deceptively simple enumerations which posed the problems of therapeutic group living with which workers in resident institutions daily grapple. It is to one of these that my remarks are addressed: "We must learn much more than we now know about how to group children for group living."

The composition of groups in the larger residential treatment center is an administrative function since it involves first the decision to accept a child, and after admission the assignment to a series of group experiences in cottage, class, shop or work and recreation. While these decisions are clinically guided and should have consensus agreement from the various functional program units, they are not made by practitioner staff, but by supervisory or administrative personnel. What occurs after assignment in the daily life of a child as a member of the composed groups is a practitioner staff function.

Reviewing experiences over a number of years, as a member of intake committees and therapeutically oriented committees responsible for the assignment of children to living as well as educational and recreational groups, I believe there may be identified a number of continuous factors which recur in the evaluations preceding assignment of a child to a group.

The persons making an assignment decision take into account the qualities of the available adult leadership, and this defines the perceived limits of the varieties of children who may be served. Different program divisions consist of a series of adults, each of whom has a distinctive style of life, which supervision may be variously effective in

\* Studt, Mrs. Elliot, "Therapeutic Factors in Group Living," *CHILD WELFARE*, January 1956.

changing. This life style is uniquely capable of providing a therapeutic experience for a range of children. The staff member who is a vigorous, outgoing person, enjoying hard play and work, big muscle activity and strenuous tasks, who is a "benign sergeant" with a loyal following, has qualities which meet the unconscious needs and conscious desires of certain types of youngsters in residential treatment. Another member of the staff whose life patterns include quiet order, undemanding relationships, objectivity, intellectual understanding, skill with plastic arts, tenderness, encouragement and tolerance for the individuality of sensitive children and those who behave strangely, has capacities to meet the needs of others.

The range of youngsters which should be in groups having a life experience together, therefore, depends in part on the traits, personality, and temperament of the staff leadership. Whether a group should have modality by the criteria mentioned by Fritz Redl—developmental stages, cultural tastes, personality organization for impulse control—depends on the staff leadership, for

- 1) if the group has modality, the staff member must have qualities which respond adequately to this;
- 2) there are staff who can encompass and respond therapeutically to a bimodal or trimodal group.

The point here is that the complex transactions among children in a cottage, class or club and between the children and their adult leadership, is in large measure a function of the human qualities of the adult leadership.

Below are a few further observations concerning grouping, induced from participating with staffs in assigning children to various life experiences with therapeutic goals.

The motivation of the assignment staff is to compose groups in which the child-child and child-adult transactions are tension minimizing.

Implicitly the reduction of tension is conceived to be therapeutic, even with behavior disorders, where the dynamic is the discharge of anxiety into aggressive and/or destructive activity; for these youngsters good controls coupled with warm relationships might result in the replacement of continuously discharged anxiety by intra-psyche conflict, but the nourishment and strength of the relationship reduces the over-all anxiety.

The goal seems to be to compose groups assigned to staff so that the transactions are mutually need-satisfying. This has meant for some staffs, groups with modal qualities (intellectually, culturally, developmentally, chronologically, in impulse organization, diagnostically, etc.) and for other staffs, groups with diversity.

BARNEY RABINOW

*Program Director, The Children's Village  
Dobbs Ferry-on-Hudson, N. Y.*

## BOOK NOTES

**Executive Responsibility**, by Ray Johns. Association Press, N. Y., 1954. 258 pp. \$4.00.

Mr. Johns' book has its outstanding value in the integration it achieves in the major elements of the administrative job: orientation to changing concepts and growing knowledge; analysis of the "essence" of processes; recognition of practical operating responsibilities and consideration of the dynamic factors inherent in the administrative process.

Though the title indicates the focus, this book will have high appeal for all who have an intimate part in the operation of an agency. Executives will profit from it. Reading it is a stimulating exercise in self-evaluation.

"Getting decisions made and carried out" is at the core of the task, states Mr. Johns. "What decisions are made and how they are made largely determines the quality of administration." Decisions grow best out of "cumulative responsibility."

Mr. Johns refers to numerous studies from industry, business and government in support of this principle.

"We measure . . . effectiveness not in terms of the leadership he exercises but in terms of the leadership he evokes; . . . in terms of the power he releases in others; . . . in terms of the goals and plans people work out for themselves with his help. . . ."

One feels that Mr. Johns may have enjoyed most writing the chapters in the book's third section (Facilitating The Administrative Process): "Maintaining Communication and Participation," "Getting Decisions Made," "Understanding Authority and Leadership" and "Widely Distributed Satisfaction." Here his own rich experience is reflected.

The skillful executive seeks the fullest possible involvement of his subordinates in the enabling, energizing, coordinating and evaluative functions of his leadership. He can accomplish these most fully when his co-workers are attuned to his administrative ideology, have defined the ways in which they can contribute actively and creatively and can take initiative for appropriate attitudes and behavior. Caseworkers and group workers will find much thoughtful discussion of this with emphasis on the idea that con-

cern with the problems of administration "are a part of every worker's job."

In the reviewer's experience board members at times are impatient with what appears to them an unnecessarily cumbersome method of getting things done. They may not see readily why there must be consultation "from the bottom up." Reading of this book by board members may be a shortcut to grasping why social agency executives attach so much importance to administrative methods that are consistent with the basic philosophy of the agency.

The first two sections of the book deal with the nature of administrative processes and the various areas of executive responsibility. Basic concepts are summarized but more than a re-hash of the standard texts on administration is offered. In recent years considerable research has been carried out "revealing new insights about the human relationships involved in organizational activity." Mr. Johns distills from this literature those findings that are relevant and applicable to the work of social agencies.

Some readers may feel that this compactly written book has too much the quality of a compendium. There is frequent documentation and an extensive bibliography for those who wish to refer to the sources in which ideas and research findings are given fuller treatment.

FRANKLIN R. KING

*Executive Secretary, Vermont Children's Aid Society  
Burlington*

●  
**The Encyclopedia of Child Care and Guidance**, edited by Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg. Doubleday & Co., Inc., N. Y., 1954. 1016 pp. \$7.50.

This volume of over one thousand pages and weighing five pounds may defeat its purpose by its size, bulk, and redundant completeness. It is divided into two parts, which most readers would find more convenient and readable if divided into two volumes. Part I—"Ready References to Child Care and Guidance"—consists of six hundred pages of alphabetically arranged references to everything from "Abilities" to "Youth Organizations," and from "Gamma Globulin"



to "Permanent Waves." "Sterility" is discussed for a full page, with a cross reference to "Reproduction." "Family Size" occupies almost a page, with cross references to "Brothers and Sisters" and "Family Living" and to the chapter in Part II on "Family Life is Changing." Some rather frightening statistics are presented indicating that our population is expanding at an unprecedented rate, but nowhere are birth control, planned parenthood, or child spacing mentioned; even in the section listing "Agencies and Organizations" and in the section "For Further Reading," birth control is omitted, whereas fertility is included. The six hundred-page Encyclopedia does contain many very readable, succinct discussions of topics of concern to parents. It also contains many tiresome generalizations, and much space is taken up by too obvious or redundant cross references. Much good factual material is included, but in this reviewer's opinion it could be just as well presented in a more conventional and compact volume with fewer headings and a good index.

Between the Encyclopedia and Part II, there are sixty-odd pages listing helpful "Agencies and Organizations" and "Further Reading." These will prove more helpful to parents and the lay reader than to professional workers, but one fears that a book as large and expensive as this will find its way into only a limited number of homes. Certainly no one can quarrel with the references included, but presumably those who invest in such an Encyclopedia will not want it soon to become dated. The earliest reference listed is to a publication in 1935. Most of the references are to works which appeared in the early 1950's. By 1965, this list of references will seem to belong peculiarly to a single decade and will lack the perspective of historical interest as well as timeliness. This is the inevitable limitation of a current reading list in the inflexible format of such a ponderous volume.

Part II merits careful consideration and reading by anyone interested in children or education. This reviewer wishes that it had been published as a separate book under its

own title "Basic Aspects of Child Development." It consists of 30 chapters by different specialists, all well-known and skillful writers.

If the present volume were not so unwieldy it would be pure pleasure, as well as informative, to read many of these chapters. It is in this part of the book that the editors accomplish what in their Foreword and Introduction they say they purport to do. From these clearly written chapters the reader, professional or lay, can learn much. Repeatedly, as one reads these chapters, one feels the marvel of human growth which for so many years has inspired the work of Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg.

FLORENCE CLOTHIER, M.D.

*Staff Psychiatrist*

*New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass.*

### Child Welfare Awards

Marshall Field, President of the Child Welfare League of America, has announced the formation of Marshall Field Awards, Inc., a non-profit organization "to recognize and reward fundamental and imaginative contributions to the well-being of children." Six to nine awards will be made annually to individuals, organizations, and communities in the fields of education, physical and mental development, social welfare and communications. Each award will consist of \$2000, a scroll and a statuette. The winners will be selected by a board of directors which is composed of recognized authorities in child life. The first awards will be made this year, and the deadline for nominations for the awards is October 1, 1956.

Offices for the new organization have been opened at 598 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.

### Correction

The information following the name of Richard Frank, M.D., author of "What The Adoption Worker Should Know About Infertility," which appeared in the February, 1956 issue of CHILD WELFARE, should have read: Medical Director, Planned Parenthood Association, Chicago Area; Attending Staff, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill.; Northwestern University Medical School, Chicago, Illinois.

# CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per word; boxed ads at \$6.50 per inch; minimum insertion, \$2.50. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation is eighth of month prior to month of publication. Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person presently holding the job knows that the ad is being placed.

**CASEWORKER** — woman — for small progressive institution caring for boys and girls. Member CWLA. Small case load, psychiatric consultation. Supervision by casework director. Master's degree social work required plus experience in children's psychiatric clinic or child welfare agency. Beginning salary \$4320-\$4500. Write Miss Maxine Elliott, Director, Hathaway Home, 840 North Ave., 66, Los Angeles 42, Calif.

**CASEWORKER III** in parent-child guidance service which is a service to families with troubled boys between the ages of 6-18; psychiatric and psychological consultation available. Requirements: Master's degree social work school plus five years' experience following graduation; experience in counseling with children and parents preferred. Man. Salary \$4572-\$5832, five-step plan. Social Security and retirement, health insurance paid by agency. Milton L. Goldberg, Executive Director, Jewish Big Brothers Association, Room 366, 590 N. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles 4, Calif.

**TWO CASEWORKERS** for Child Welfare Services positions in Family and Children's Section of San Mateo County Department of Public Health and Welfare. Master's degree social work and three years' experience required—preferably in a CWLA agency providing foster family care and adoption service. Salary \$4704-\$5892. Write: Harold E. Simmons, Department of Public Health and Welfare, 225-37th Ave., San Mateo, Calif.

**CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WORKER** — Several openings in adoptions, child placement and protective services in public agency providing broad program of special services to children. Professional supervision; good promotional opportunities. At least one year graduate social work plus appropriate experience required. Salary beginning at \$360. Write San Diego County Personnel Department, 402 Civic Center, San Diego, Calif.

**CASEWORKERS.** Two openings in County Welfare Department: one in adoptions; one in child welfare services. Full professional training with experience substitution possible. Beginning salary \$3864 or \$4046, dependent on training and experience. Write Mr. Charles R. Ingram, Director, Court House, Santa Barbara, Calif.

**CHALLENGING POSITIONS** in field of juvenile delinquency prevention and control are now available with City of San Diego, salary to \$5796. Master's degree social work or professional experience in family counseling, group therapy or working with emotionally disturbed children required. Apply San Diego City Civil Service, Room 453, Civic Center, San Diego, Calif.

**SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA:** Openings for family and child welfare caseworkers (2). New salary scales effective March, 1956: Social Worker Grade I to \$4908, Social Worker Grade II to \$5424, Social Worker Grade III to \$6132. For further information and description of grade qualifications write: Executive Director, Catholic Social Service of San Francisco, 1825 Mission Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.

**COME TO COLORFUL COLORADO!** Immediate opportunities for qualified Child Welfare Workers in CWLA and APWA member agency. Salary range \$3624-\$4596. Excellent employee benefits, fully-qualified supervision. Psychiatric services. Unusual opportunity for professional development in complete child welfare program. Promotional opportunities. Write Personnel Officer, Denver Department of Welfare, 777 Cherokee, Denver, Colo.

**CHILD WELFARE WORKER** in local public welfare department to carry casework services and placement in subsidized foster homes of children referred to department and to work with unmarried mothers. Requirements: Master's degree social work school, or one year in school of social work plus one year social work experience. Salary \$4368-\$5200. Complete details by writing to Director of Personnel, Municipal Building, Hartford, Conn.

**CASEWORKERS (3)** in private, nonsectarian, statewide, multiple-function agency. Small case loads, excellent supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. Openings in Hartford in newly established Protective Services Unit and in child placing. Other coming openings in New London and Norwalk District Offices. Requirements: Master's degree social work school, some experience preferable. Salary scale \$3800-\$5300 with appointment to \$4700 depending on experience. Please write C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

**CASEWORKER** in family-children's service agency providing family casework, specialized services to unmarried mothers, child placement and adoption. Salary comparable with good practice. Social Security and retirement. Write Miss Jane K. Dewell, Executive Secretary, Catholic Social Service Bureau, 478 Orange St., New Haven, Conn.

**CASEWORKER** in multiple-function, private, nonsectarian, child welfare agency. Case load of emotionally disturbed children in institutional setting. Psychiatric consultation. Good personnel practices. Top salary limit \$5600. Minimum requirements: two years' graduate social work training. Complete details by writing Anna K. Buell, Casework Supervisor, Children's Center, 1400 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.

**FLORIDA—SUPERVISORS AND CASEWORKERS**—All pioneering is not in the West. Florida, the fastest growing state in the new industrial South, is building dynamic and forward-moving social services. Far from being just a place to which to retire, Florida offers many opportunities to younger people as a place to live and work. Youthful, professionally trained caseworkers and supervisors are needed in several Florida cities in statewide private agency offering adoption placement and related services. Agency now under professional executive leadership of Walter R. Sherman. Appointment salaries range \$3600-\$5500, depending on experience and job responsibility. Write Miss Cornelia Wallace, Associate Director for Casework, CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF FLORIDA, P.O. Box 5722, Jacksonville 7, Fla.